



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,373	11/19/2001	Hiroyuki Karasawa	Q66793	8362

7590 03/26/2004

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

LUU, THANH X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2878

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/988,373

Applicant(s)

KARASAWA, HIROYUKI

Examiner

Thanh X Luu

Art Unit

2878

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-17 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to amendments and remarks filed December 9, 2003. Claims 1-17 are currently pending.

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 3-6, it is unclear in its given context what "an ineffective reading period in a period of reading one line of image" means. That is, in a period of reading, reading is effective.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent 4,908,511).

Regarding claim 1, Ishikawa et al. disclose (see Figure 2) an image processing apparatus having an image reading unit for reading an image per line from a sheet-like recording medium (S) by applying a laser beam to the medium and scanning the medium with the laser beam in a main scanning direction (B), comprising: a controller (not shown, see also claim 1, "means for reading image information") for controlling reading of the image from the medium, the controller being operable in synchronism with a main scanning synchronizing signal (see column 5, lines 1-2; see also claim 1, last lines).

6. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arakawa et al. (U.S. Patent 4,959,545).

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Arakawa et al. disclose (see Figure 2) an image processing apparatus having an image reading unit for reading an image per line from a sheet-like recording medium (10) by applying a laser beam to the medium and scanning the medium with the laser beam in a main scanning direction (X), comprising: a controller (20) for controlling reading of the image from the medium, the controller being operable in synchronism with a main scanning synchronizing signal (S2). Arakawa et al. also disclose (see Figure 2) means for generating a signal (S3) to manage displaying (23) of the image in synchronism with the synchronizing signal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2878

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either one of Ishikawa et al. or Arakawa et al. in view of Agano (U.S. Patent 5,051,588).

Regarding claims 2 and 9, Ishikawa et al. and Arakawa et al. disclose the claimed invention as set forth above. Ishikawa et al. and Arakawa et al. do not specifically disclose shading correction as claimed. Agano teaches (see Figure) performing shading correction and providing deflector and performing shading correction depending on facet characteristics of the deflector (see column 6, lines 5-10). Thus, Agano recognizes that improved detection is effected with shading correction. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform shading correction in the apparatus of Ishikawa et al. or Arakawa et al. in view of Agano to improve detection.

Regarding claim 7, Ishikawa et al. and Arakawa et al. disclose the claimed invention as set forth above. Ishikawa et al. and Arakawa et al. do not specifically disclose shading correction as claimed. Agano further teaches (see Figure) an D/A converter and means for adding (47) as claimed. A clock signal is inherent since a controller automatically controls the operation of the device. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform shading correction in the apparatus of Ishikawa et al. or Arakawa et al. in view of Agano to improve detection.

9. Claims 11-12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either one of Ishikawa et al. or Arakawa et al. in view of Shimura et al. (U.S. Patent 4,859,849).

Regarding claims 11-12 and 14-17, Ishikawa et al. and Arakawa et al. disclose the claimed invention as set forth above. Ishikawa et al. and Arakawa et al. do not specifically disclose a feeding controller or an erasing controller. Shimura et al. teach (see Figures 7 and 8) a controller for performing feeding or erasing as claimed. Furthermore, it is well known to interoperate various controllers in a system or control a loader of a cassette. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide another controller to perform feeding or erasing in the apparatus of Ishikawa et al. or Arakawa et al. in view of Shimura et al. to effectively scan and re-use the medium, and thereby reducing costs.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 8, 4-6 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh X. Luu whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2878

2441. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta, can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

txl
February 26, 2004



Thanh X. Luu
Primary Examiner